

ENDOGENOUS AND EXOGENOUS EFFECTS IN CONTAGION AND DIFFUSION MODELS OF TERRORIST ACTIVITY

BY GENTRY WHITE

*Queensland University of Technology
Brisbane, Queensland
Australia*

AND

BY FABRIZIO RUGGERI

*Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche Istituto di Matematica Applicata e
Tecnologie Informatiche
Milano, Italy*

and

*Institute of Future Environments, Queensland University of Technology
Brisbane, Queensland
Australia*

AND

BY MICHAEL D. PORTER

*University of Alabama
Tuscaloosa, Alabama
USA*

Variation in rates of terrorist activity over time is explained via contagion or diffusion. Models for social contagion and diffusion are shown to be cases of the cluster process representation of the Hawkes self-exciting process model. Contagion and diffusion models exploring variations in endogenous and exogenous effects are fitted to data from the Global Terrorism Database for 2000–2015. Model selection criteria are shown to differentiate between contagion and diffusion process and events with high fatalities exhibit less influence on the probability of future events. The practical applications of these results include exploratory modelling to inform policy decisions.

AMS 2000 subject classifications: Primary 62-07, Data Analysis; secondary 62P25, Applications to Social Sciences

Keywords and phrases: Social Contagion, Diffusion, Hawkes Self-exciting process, Terrorism

1. Introduction. Acts of terrorism¹ create a disproportionate sense of urgency and threat (Bandura, 1990; Crenshaw, 1981, 1986; Hutchinson, 1972; Thornton, 1964). This is due in part to the relative rarity of terrorist events making their occurrence seem random and unpredictable. This perceived threat is also exacerbated by the clustering of events in space and time (Braithwaite and Johnson, 2012; Heyman and Mickolus, 1980; Holden, 1986; LaFree, Dugan and Korte, 2009; Li and Thompson, 1975; Midlarsky, 1978; Midlarsky, Crenshaw and Yoshida, 1980; Telesca and Lovallo, 2006; Townsley, 2008). While the occurrence of a few closely spaced events, especially after a long period of inactivity, can create the impression of a “wave” or “hotspot” of terrorism, this seemingly erratic pattern can be attributed to one of two underlying mechanisms of propagation: contagion or diffusion.

Social contagion theory states that individuals imitate behaviours that have positive outcomes in situations perceived as similar to their own (Ogunlade, 1979). In the context of terrorism this refers to the ability of the occurrence of terrorist acts to the transfer intent, motive, and/or knowledge to carry out terrorist acts over space and time to a receptive context (Braithwaite, 2010; Brosius and Weimann, 1991; Brynjar and Skjølberg, 2000; Buhaug and Gleditsch, 2008; Hacker, 1981; Hamilton and Hamilton, 1983; Heyman and Mickolus, 1980; Hill and Rothchild, 1986; Holden, 1986; Midlarsky, Crenshaw and Yoshida, 1980; Weimann and Brosius, 1988).

The term diffusion includes several mechanisms involving contact between cultures, including the movement of populations across space and time, for the transfer of cultural practices. It also appears in the literature of political violence and terrorism describing the spread of violence (Braithwaite, 2010; Brynjar and Skjølberg, 2000; Faber, Houweling and Siccama, 1984; Gurr, 1993; Midlarsky, 1978; Most and Starr, 1980; Pitcher, Hamblin and Miller, 1978), but in many examples there is no clear distinction between the terms “contagion” and “diffusion”. Where the distinction is clear, the definition emerges of diffusion as a process where multiple terrorist acts are undertaken independently in response to external stimuli, or where multiple terrorist events are attributable to a single entity (individual or group) over space and/or time. This is the definition used in this paper for the construction of a model for diffusion.

Hamilton and Hamilton (1981) describes the social contagion model as having a rate of events that is a product of two functions, one that is endogenous (depends on the number of prior events at times $s < t$, but not on the current time t), and one

¹The definition of terrorism is contested (see Hoffman, 2006; Schmid and Jongman, 2005, for an entrée into this discussion), in this paper the term “terrorist” and “terrorism” refer only to the fact that the events analysed in this paper are drawn from the Global Terrorism Database (National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism (START), 2015).

that is exogenous (depends on time t but not on the prior event history). Defining the social contagion model in terms of the product of exogenous and endogenous processes makes sense; the definition of social contagion describes the interaction of observed events (endogenous effects) and the observer's perception of their circumstances (exogenous effects). In the diffusion process, the rate is defined as the sum of the exogenous and endogenous processes. In diffusion multiple individuals or entities may respond independently to external stimuli (exogenous effects), or a single entity or individual may decide to commit multiple acts, their capacity or inclination to do so influenced by previous activity (endogenous effects); theirs and/or others. In the case of diffusion, the "or" indicates the relative independence of the exogenous and endogenous effects, making the assumption of additivity reasonable.

These exogenous and endogenous effects can be related to the cluster and baseline processes of the convolution model interpretation of Hawkes' self-exciting process model [Hawkes \(1971a,b\)](#), described in [Hawkes and Oakes \(1974\)](#), which attributes events to one of the two processes. Hawkes' self-exciting process model [Hawkes \(1971a\)](#) is also similar to previous models proposed for contagion processes in [Coleman \(1964\)](#); [Diekmann \(1979\)](#) and [Hamilton and Hamilton \(1981\)](#); [Holden \(1986, 1987\)](#), and has been successfully applied to insurgent activity ([Lewis et al., 2011](#)), crime ([Mohler, 2013](#); [Mohler et al., 2011](#)), and terrorism ([Porter and White, 2012](#); [White, Porter and Mazerolle, 2013](#)).

The results of this current paper demonstrate that depending on the parameterisation, the cluster process version of the Hawkes model can be used to effectively model either a contagion or a diffusion process for the spread of terrorism, and address the issue of non-stationarity in the data. A new implementation of the negative-binomial convolution model based on a Bayesian hierarchical model facilitates computation and allows for a straightforward interpretation of the model results.

The structure of this paper is as follows: In [Section 2](#) the proposed model is developed and the Bayesian implementation illustrated. [Section 3](#) contains a discussion of the data and variables from the Global Terrorism Database ([National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism \(START\), 2015](#)) used in this paper. In [Section 4](#) computational strategies are discussed and the results are presented. In [Section 5](#) some discussion of the results and their implications is presented.

2. Contagion, Diffusion and Self-Exciting Process Models. The modern concept of a social "contagion" as an explanation for aberrant behaviour in groups dates to the late 19th century ([Le Bon, 1896](#)) and its application to political violence or upheaval dates at least to the mid-twentieth century ([Hopper, 1950](#)), remaining

a viable theory for terrorism and political violence (Braithwaite, 2010; Brynjar and Skjølberg, 2000; Buhaug and Gleditsch, 2008; Cliff and First, 2013; Gurr, 1993; Hamilton and Hamilton, 1983; Hill and Rothchild, 1986; Holden, 1986; Midlarsky, 1978; Midlarsky, Crenshaw and Yoshida, 1980; Pitcher, Hamblin and Miller, 1978; Weimann and Brosius, 1988). The mathematical and statistical concept of a “contagious” process is similarly well established (Feller, 1943; Greenwood and Yule, 1920; Neyman, 1939) and the application of a model based approach to describing the theoretical dynamics of terrorism emerges in the social sciences with Coleman (1964), followed by the development of theoretically based models (Diekmann, 1979; Hamilton and Hamilton, 1981, 1983).

In the physical and mathematical sciences, the term diffusion refers to a clearly defined and well-understood phenomenon studied since the mid-19th century (Einstein, 1905; Fick, 1855; Onsager, 1931; Teorell, 1936); its use in sociological studies dates from the late 19th and early 20th centuries (Frobenius, 1897/98; Kroeber, 1940) describing several mechanisms for the transfer of knowledge and cultural practices, including both contacts between and the migration of populations (Winthrop, 1991). In the terrorism and political violence literature, diffusion often is discussed in conjunction with the term contagion to describe the spread of terrorism and political violence (Braithwaite, 2010; Brynjar and Skjølberg, 2000; Faber, Houweling and Siccama, 1984; Gurr, 1993; Midlarsky, 1978; Most and Starr, 1980; Pitcher, Hamblin and Miller, 1978). This seems ambiguous, but a close reading of the literature reveals that while the term diffusion is sometimes used to describe a phenomenon rather than a specific mechanism (i.e. contagion), sometimes it is used to describe a mechanism that differs from social contagion. The definition of diffusion proposed in this paper, in the context of terrorism, is a process where either multiple terrorist acts are undertaken independently in response to some external stimuli, or that multiple terrorist events are attributable to a single entity (individual or group) over space and/or time.

2.1. The Hawkes Self-Exciting Process Model. The Hawkes self-exciting process model (Hawkes, 1971a,b) is a point-process model for clustering behaviour that is popular in a wide variety of applications modelling social dynamics including, crime, insurgent activity, and terrorism (Lewis et al., 2011; Mohler, 2013; Mohler et al., 2011; Porter and White, 2012; White, Porter and Mazerolle, 2013). It can be shown that the contagion models developed in the social sciences beginning with Coleman (1964) and the Hawkes process model are fundamentally related, and that depending on parameterisation and interpretation, the Hawkes process model can describe both the contagion and diffusion processes defined in this paper.

The discrete time version of the Hawkes self-exciting process model based on

the Poisson point-process model, defined by the intensity function λ_t where Y_t is the number of events in the interval at time t and $E(Y_t) = \lambda_t$. The intensity function of the Hawkes process model is given in [White, Porter and Mazerolle \(2013\)](#) as

$$(1) \quad \lambda_t = \mu + \delta \sum_{s < t} Y_s g(t-s), \quad \mu > 0, \quad 0 < \delta < 1.$$

In this version of the Hawkes model the exogenous and endogenous effects are identified by noting that in (1) the exogenous effects are described by the terms (μ, δ) outside of the summation and the endogenous effects are described by the terms within the summation $(Y_s, g(\cdot))$. The term μ is a baseline or background rate of terrorist events, δ is called the volatility parameter, also defined as the expected number of events attributable to the increase in intensity caused by an event. Past events are weighted by a probability mass function $g(\cdot)$ such that $\sum_1^\infty g(u) = 1$, which reduces the influence of events as they become more distant in time so that λ_t decreases as the time between events increases. These weights and the constraint $0 < \delta < 1$ ensure stationarity. The difference between contagion and diffusion can be described in these terms as well, in contagion models, exogenous factors affect volatility, and in diffusion models, they affect the baseline or background rate of events.

2.2. Contagion and Diffusion Models. The contagion models for terrorist activity in [Coleman \(1964\)](#); [Diekmann \(1979\)](#); [Hamilton and Hamilton \(1981\)](#), and [Hamilton and Hamilton \(1983\)](#) are similar to the Hawkes model, both in form and intent. Letting $N_t = \sum_{s < t} Y_s$ be the number of events up to but not including time t , the intensity function proposed by [Coleman \(1964\)](#) is

$$(2) \quad \lambda_t = \alpha + \beta N_t, \quad \alpha > 0, \quad \beta > 0$$

where the intensity, or frequency of events, increases linearly with N_t . The intensity function proposed in [Hamilton and Hamilton \(1981\)](#) is

$$(3) \quad \lambda_t = A \exp(\alpha + \beta N_t + \gamma N_t^2), \quad A > 0, \quad (\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in \mathbb{R}.$$

When $\gamma = 0$ and $\beta > 0$ this is essentially the same as (2), in that the rate is increasing monotonically with the number of events. If $\beta > 0, \gamma < 0$, the intensity decreases when $N_t > \beta/2\gamma$, as suggested in [Diekmann \(1979\)](#), which is similar mathematically to the constraints in (1) to ensure stationarity. [Hamilton and Hamilton \(1981\)](#) is clear that in (3) the terms of the exponential function are endogenous and that A represents the exogenous effects. It is also clearly stated that the overall intensity is the product of the two. Following this idea, the contagion model is written in terms of (1) as

$$(4) \quad \lambda_t = \mu + \delta_t \sum_{s < t} Y_s g(t-s).$$

The term μ represents boundary conditions, ensuring that $\lambda_t > 0$, and δ_t represents exogenous effects, and is only subject to the constraint that $\delta_t > 0$. When $\delta_t > 1$, the model becomes non-stationary, either temporarily or over all observations.

The diffusion model is also a slightly re-written form of (1)

$$(5) \quad \lambda_t = \mu_t + \delta \sum_{s < t} Y_s g(t - s).$$

In this case, the intensity is the sum of the exogenous and endogenous effects. Thus the diffusion model is defined by allowing the baseline rate (μ_t) in the model to vary over time depending on the exogenous effects.

2.3. A Model for Exogenous and Endogenous Effects. Both the contagion and diffusion models can exhibit non-stationarity, depending on the form and values for δ_t and μ_t . The distinction should be noted that even though both models incorporate exogenous and endogenous effects, in the contagion model, an increase in intensity is only possible due to endogenous effects (when an event occurs); in the diffusion model, the intensity can increase independently of the endogenous process. This is important to keep in mind as the interpretation of endogenous and exogenous effects can differ as between the two models.

This interpretation is facilitated using the cluster process interpretation of the Hawkes model in [Hawkes and Oakes \(1974\)](#). In this interpretation, the total number of events observed at time t is the sum of events from a baseline process and a cluster process, i.e $Y_t = Y_t^b + Y_t^c$. If $Y_t^b \sim p_b$ and $Y_t^c \sim p_c$, where $p_b(\cdot)$ and $p_c(\cdot)$ are probability mass functions (pmfs) defined over the non-negative integers, then

$$(6) \quad p(Y_t) = \sum_{z=0}^{Y_t} p_b(Y_t - z) p_c(z).$$

When $p_b(\cdot)$ and $p_c(\cdot)$ are both Poisson pmfs with parameters λ_t^b and λ_t^c respectively, then (6) has a closed form, and Y_t is from a Poisson pmf with parameter $\lambda_y = \lambda_t^b + \lambda_t^c$. Considering λ_t as in (1), then

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_t^b &= \mu \\ \lambda_t^c &= \delta \sum_{s < t} Y_s g(t - s). \end{aligned}$$

The interpretation is straightforward: λ_t^b is the rate for the non-contagion process, and λ_t^c is the rate for the contagion process. In the diffusion model, the rate of baseline events is a function of exogenous factors and the rate of cluster events is dependent only on the endogenous factors. In the contagion model, the rate of baseline events is constant and the rate of cluster process events is a function of both endogenous and exogenous factors.

2.4. *A Hierarchical Negative-Binomial Convolution Likelihood.* While the Poisson convolution model has a convenient closed form, the counts of terrorist events are typically over-dispersed and can be modelled more accurately using a negative-binomial convolution. Difficulties evaluating the negative-binomial convolution model using (6) directly can be avoided by using the relationship between the negative-binomial pmf and the Poisson pmf when the mean of the Poisson pmf is itself a Gamma random variable. If $Y_t = Y_t^b + Y_t^c \sim \mathcal{Pois}(\lambda_t^b + \lambda_t^c)$, then it can be shown that

$$(7) \quad Y_t^b | Y_t, \lambda_t^b, \lambda_t^c \sim \text{Binom}\left(Y_t, \frac{\lambda_t^b}{\lambda_t^b + \lambda_t^c}\right);$$

see Daley and Vere-Jones (2003) for details. Furthermore, if

$$(8) \quad p(Y_t^k = y | \lambda_t^k) = \frac{(\lambda_t^k)^y e^{-\lambda_t^k}}{y!}, \quad k = b, c$$

and

$$(9) \quad p(\lambda_t^k) = \left(\frac{\sigma^k}{\mu_t^k}\right)^{\sigma^k} \frac{(\lambda_t^k)^{\sigma^k-1} e^{-\lambda_t^k \frac{\sigma^k}{\mu_t^k}}}{\Gamma(\sigma^k)}, \quad k = b, c$$

then the resulting negative-binomial pmf is

$$(10) \quad p(Y_t^k = y) = \frac{\Gamma(\sigma^k + y)}{y! \Gamma(\sigma^k)} \left(\frac{\mu_t^k}{\sigma^k + \mu_t^k}\right)^y \left(\frac{\sigma^k}{\sigma^k + \mu_t^k}\right)^{\sigma^k}, \quad y \in \mathbb{N}, \quad k = b, c.$$

(7)–(10) show that Y_t^b and Y_t^c are *marginally* distributed as negative-binomial random variables, thus Y_t is the sum of two negative-binomial random variables, even though $Y_t | \lambda_t^b, \lambda_t^c \sim \mathcal{Pois}(\lambda_t^b + \lambda_t^c)$ is *conditionally* distributed as a Poisson random variable as is Y_t^b and Y_t^c . The resulting joint likelihood is written as (11), where $\mathbf{Y} = \{Y_t : \forall t\}$, $\mathbf{\Lambda}_b = \{\lambda_t^b : \forall t\}$, and $\mathbf{\Lambda}_c = \{\lambda_t^c : \forall t\}$. A hierarchical Bayesian model using (7)–(11) yields the negative-binomial convolution model shown in (12)–(17) that has the benefit of not requiring the explicit evaluation of the negative-binomial convolution likelihood as in White and Porter (2013), and can allow for a Poisson-negative-binomial convolution model.

$$(11) \quad L(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{\Lambda}_b, \mathbf{\Lambda}_c) = \prod_{t=1}^T \frac{(\lambda_t^b + \lambda_t^c)^{Y_t} \exp(-(\lambda_t^b + \lambda_t^c))}{Y_t!}$$

$$(12) \quad Y_t^c | Y_t, \lambda_t^b, \lambda_t^c \sim \text{Binom}\left(Y_t, \frac{\lambda_t^c}{\lambda_t^b + \lambda_t^c}\right)$$

$$(13) \quad Y_t^b | Y_t, Y_t^b = Y_t - Y_t^c$$

$$(14) \quad \lambda_t^b \sim \mathcal{G}\left(\sigma^b, \frac{\mu_t^b}{\sigma^b}\right)$$

$$(15) \quad \lambda_t^c \sim \mathcal{G}\left(\sigma^c, \frac{\mu_t^c}{\sigma^c}\right)$$

$$(16) \quad Y_t^b | \mu_t^b, \sigma^b \sim \text{NegBinom}(\mu_t^b, \sigma^b)$$

$$(17) \quad Y_t^c | \mu_t^c, \sigma^c \sim \text{NegBinom}(\mu_t^c, \sigma^c)$$

There are two aspects of (12)–(17) that bear clarification. First, (12) and (13) are used only to generate values of Y_t^b and Y_t^c as a part of the MCMC scheme; and second, $Y_t^b \sim \mathcal{P}(\lambda_t^b)$ and $Y_t^c \sim \mathcal{P}(\lambda_t^c)$ are used with (14) and (15) to derive (16) and (17).

In order to incorporate endogenous and exogenous effects in the model, let $\mathbf{x}_t$ be a vector of exogenous covariates at time t , and let $\mathbf{w}_s$ be a vector of endogenous covariates at time s . The endogenous effects also include function $g(\cdot)$ in (1), a shifted negative-binomial pmf with mean and dispersion parameters $\boldsymbol{\phi} = (\phi_1, \phi_1)$, as in Porter and White (2012); White and Porter (2013); White, Porter and Mazze-rolle (2013). These effects can then be included in μ_t^b , δ_t , and μ_t^c , and the remaining

priors are defined

$$(18) \quad \mu_t^b = \exp(\mathbf{x}_t \boldsymbol{\beta})$$

$$(19) \quad \pi(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \propto 1$$

$$(20) \quad \delta_t = \exp(\mathbf{x}_t \boldsymbol{\gamma})$$

$$(21) \quad \pi(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \propto 1$$

$$(22) \quad \mu_t^c = \sum_{s < t} Z_s g(t - s; \boldsymbol{\phi})$$

$$(23) \quad Z_s = \alpha_s Y_s$$

$$(24) \quad \alpha_s = \exp(\mathbf{w}_s \boldsymbol{\eta})$$

$$(25) \quad \pi(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \propto 1$$

$$(26) \quad \pi(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \prod_{i=1}^2 (1 + \phi_i)^{-2}$$

$$(27) \quad \pi(\sigma^b) = (1 + \sigma^b)^{-2}$$

$$(28) \quad \pi(\sigma^c) = (1 + \sigma^c)^{-2}.$$

This is the complete model for social contagion or diffusion based on the Hawkes self-exciting process model.

3. Data and Covariates. The Global Terrorism Database, with over 140,000 records of terrorist incidents from 1970 through 2015, is used as the source for data. Incidents are based on open-source records including over 4,000,000 news articles from over 25,000 sources. There are at least 45 covariates for each record, with newer cases having over 120 covariates. Both contagion and diffusion models from Section 2 are fitted to the data from Afghanistan, Iraq, Israel, and the West Bank and Gaza Strip, and the results are compared using the Watanabe-Akaike Information Criterion, or alternatively the widely applicable information criterion (WAIC) introduced in [Watanabe \(2010\)](#).

Identifying contagion or diffusion as the mechanism based solely on the WAIC results is not without caveats: the data cover a 15 year period and it is entirely possible that both mechanisms were present over the time period either consecutively or in conjunction. The selection is made based on two possible models; it is also entirely possible that neither model is the “true” model. In light of these and other potential pitfalls, it is a good idea to compare quantitative results with qualitative data and expert knowledge. Despite these limitations, these models do provide a useful tool for exploring the data and a framework for interpreting the results in a meaningful manner.

3.1. Exogenous Covariates. Exogenous effects describe characteristics that are not aspects of the terrorist events themselves. In mathematical terms, they are any

effects that are included in the terms δ_t or μ_t^b of (4) or (5). The GTD does not contain any exogenous variables, so in order to illustrate and control for possible exogenous effects, they are modelled using a b -spline (Hastie, Tibshirani and Friedman, 2001) to account for unobserved variation over time in either μ_t^b or δ_t . For illustrative purposes, Figures 1–2 in Section 4 show some exogenous time-line events .

3.2. Endogenous Covariates. The number of fatalities is chosen as an endogenous covariate for exploration because fatality records are nearly complete in the GTD, and it manifests several possible explanations that apply in either the contagion or diffusion models. In the case of contagion, none or few fatalities are indicative of a failure, evidence suggests that in these case the contagious effect is diminished (Dugan, LaFree and Piquero, 2005; Holden, 1986). In cases where fatalities are high, the contagiousness of these events may be limited as they are seen as impeding real redress of grievances either by negative public opinion or excessive repressive measures in response (Hamilton and Hamilton, 1983). For diffusion, small scale events may be part of a pre-planned campaign, or large events may indicate an exhaustion of resources by a group or entity both of these cases point to internal group “economics” as factors in cluster size (Enders and Sandler, 2005). In order to accurately describe these potentially non-linear effects, they are incorporated into the model via a b -spline, q.v. (23).

4. Results. Contagion and diffusion models with endogenous effects were fit to data from each of the four countries selected. Initial results showed that the negative-binomial/negative binomial convolution model for the diffusion model was computationally unstable due to the shape parameter σ_b shrinking to very small values nullifying the effects of the β parameters in (18). A similar model using a Poisson/negative-binomial convolution ($\lambda_t^b = \mu_t^b$) showed both a better fit to the data and better mixing of the realisations for β s; thus it is used for the examples presented here.

The countries picked for review were not chosen randomly nor were they intended to be a representative sample. Instead, they are illustrative cases for both contagion and diffusion. The resulting analyses are presented as a statistical case study with the intent to illustrate the utility of the modelling approaches presented, and the conceptual framework of contagion and diffusion as explanatory theories for the spread of terrorism, and both exogenous and endogenous effects on the spread of terrorism. The following analyses first examine the classification and characterisation of contagion and diffusion, then the interpretation of their exogenous and endogenous effects.

4.1. *Classification via WAIC.* Each country is classified as either a contagion or diffusion process by selecting which of the models is more adequate using WAIC (Watanabe, 2010). WAIC is preferred over the Deviance Information Criterion (DIC) (Spiegelhalter et al., 2002) because it is fully Bayesian (thus avoiding the inherent difficulties in implementing DIC for a mixture model), and it closely approximates Bayesian cross validation (Gelman, Hwang and Vehtari, 2014), making it based on the model’s predictive capabilities, which is of primary interest in these examples. The WAIC defined as

$$(29) \quad \text{WAIC} = -2 \sum_{i=1}^n \log \left(\frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S p(y_i | \theta_s) \right) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}_s (\log(p(y_i | \theta))),$$

is the sum of a goodness of fit measure and a correction for model complexity. The first term in the sum (29) is -2 times the estimate of the log point-wise predictive density (lppd), the second term is -2 times the p_{WAIC} , which is the sum over the n observations of the variances over S iterations of their log point-wise predictive densities.

Based on the results in Table 1, two cases: Israel and the West Bank and Gaza Strip are identified as subject to contagion, and two cases: Afghanistan and Iraq are identified as subject to diffusion. Since both contagion and diffusion can co-

TABLE 1

Country	Model	$-2 \times \text{lppd}$	p_{WAIC}	WAIC
Afghanistan	Contagion	12920	792	14504
	Diffusion	12812	831	14473
Iraq	Contagion	15522	1513	18547
	Diffusion	15648	1435	18519
Israel	Contagion	3359	555	4470
	Diffusion	3871	342	4555
The West Bank and Gaza Strip	Contagion	3839	512	4863
	Diffusion	4286	291	4868

exist, and because they are defined in Section 1 in qualitative language, the validity of classifications based on quantitative results in Table 1 are neither absolute nor exclusive. Instead, they should be read as being only indicative of the dominant classification in each case.

4.2. *Patterns of Group Attribution.* The definitions of contagion and diffusion posited in Section 1 imply that the patterns of attribution observed in each case should differ. Contagion describes the transmission of the impetus to act between

TABLE 2
Attribution of Events by Group Rank and Country

Country	Group Rank					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Afghanistan	0.563	0.403	0.008	0.006	0.004	0.003
Iraq	0.805	0.130	0.034	0.008	0.003	0.003
Israel	0.357	0.226	0.092	0.064	0.037	0.033
West Bank and Gaza Strip	0.334	0.246	0.096	0.091	0.046	0.026

individuals or entities and diffusion attributes violence to either independent responses to external stimuli, or the actions of a single entity. These descriptions suggest that the pattern of attributions for events to multiple entities would differ, with observed events more equally distributed over entities under contagion than diffusion. Table 2 shows the proportion of events attributed to the six most active entities in each case. The results are consistent with the suggestion of how the patterns would differ. The contagion cases show a heavy-tailed distribution of attribution compared to the diffusion cases.

4.3. Exogenous Effects. The exogenous effects and a 95% confidence band for each of the four countries from the contagion and diffusion models, with several key dates for reference, are shown in Figures 1–2, comparing these Figures the preference of the diffusion model for Afghanistan and Iraq, and the preference of the contagion model for Israel and the West Bank and the Gaza Strip seem clear. In both the contagion and diffusion cases the exogenous effects (μ_t^b) vary by 2–3 orders of magnitude, but the distinction is in the actual values of μ_t^b . In the diffusion cases the patterns are similar in both Afghanistan and Iraq, with Figure 1 showing large peaks around the beginning of 2015 with values in excess of 1, this is indicative of a large number of cases attributable to the baseline process or exogenous effects. The opposite is evidenced in Figure 2, where the peaks are much lower and shorter in duration; note that the sharp increase in intensity in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip is due to an edge effect distortion from the b -spline basis functions. In the diffusion cases, Figure 1 shows that δ_t occupies a narrow band centred around 1 for most of the period. In Figure 2 δ_t varies considerably with peaks above 1 indicating non-stationarity in the contagion process.

In all cases, the events identified in Figures 1–2 coincide with changes in the exogenous effects. In the diffusion cases these are evident in the μ_t^b , and in the contagion cases in δ_t . Attributing causality to these events and the exogenous effects in the model is subjective, depending on the contextual interpretation of qualitative data. Regardless, the patterns in Figures 1 and 2 are substantial and merit consideration.

Fig 1: μ_t^b and δ_t for Afghanistan and Iraq, 95% credible interval, mean —, median - - -





Fig 2: μ_t^b and δ_t for Israel and The West Bank and Gaza Strip, 95% credible interval, mean —, median - - -




4.4. *Endogenous Effects.* Endogenous effects are interpreted in slightly different terms for the contagion and diffusion models, but in both cases, they are defined in terms of event characteristics. As an example, the number of fatalities associated with an event is explored as a possible effect. These are included in the model through the parameter $\alpha_s = \exp(\mathbf{w}_s \boldsymbol{\eta})$ as expressed in (23), where $\mathbf{w}_s$ is the vector of b -spline basis functions computed from the number of fatalities for the event(s) on day s . The use of a spline rather than a linear relationship allows for more flexibility in the estimation of the endogenous effects. Figure 3 shows estimated effects and 95% credible bands for Afghanistan, Iraq, Israel, and the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.

Contagion model results for Israel and The West Bank and the Gaza Strip in Figure 3 show that the occurrence of 2 or more fatalities is a turning point in the contagiousness of events. If there are between 0–2 fatalities, the value for α_s remains relatively constant. As the number of fatalities increases from 2, α_s decreases. Under the contagion model there are at least two possible explanations for this: first, high fatality events may discourage others from imitation as the killings may cause moral revulsion rather than sympathy; second increased security measures in the wake of high fatality incidents may also serve as a disincentive. Israel and the West Bank are geographically, historically, and perhaps most importantly economically entangled, as Figure 2 shows, the pattern of political violence within and between the two cases moves between escalation and repression, and détente and negotiation.

Under the diffusion model, the assumption is that events are clustered in time because either many disparate groups or individuals are encouraged to act by the same external influence, or that a single entity executes a sequence of events over a small span of time. Figure 3 shows a similar pattern in α_s for Afghanistan and Iraq as, with higher fatality events exerting less increase in the probability of future attacks than lower fatality events. In this case, the number of fatalities represents a relative strength of effort by the individuals involved. Large scale events require more resources, potentially exhausting or reducing the resources available to execute future events, or as in the contagion case, it may be that responses to large scale events have an inhibitive effect. The range of α_s is greater in Iraq than in Afghanistan, which is attributable in part to the differing nature of the contexts. In early 21st century Afghanistan, the Taliban was a well-organised group fighting a more conventional war against foreign force. In the same period in Iraq, there was initially no similar group as well organised, and the conflict was closer to an insurgency against an occupying force than the situation in Afghanistan.

5. Discussion. This paper presents two theoretical and mathematical models to explain variation in rates of terrorism over time and shows that for the illustrated

Fig 3: α_s for Afghanistan, Iraq, Israel and The West Bank and Gaza Strip 95% credible interval, mean —, median - - -



cases they provide agreement with the observed data and help construct a narrative. The criticism of these models and others is that beyond their mathematical “amusement” factor, what is their actual use.

One of the strengths of statistical data analysis is that it provides a platform for inference over a population-based sample, but is often asserted that statistical modelling is of limited utility in understanding terrorism as each context differs so much from the others that there is no population to sample from and nothing to infer. Philosophically, this is difficult to dispute, but practically the argument can be made that exploratory techniques focused finding underlying patterns in the data can be useful.

The casual observer can easily note that the situations in Afghanistan, Iraq, Israel and the West Bank and the Gaza Strip differ. What is interesting to note is that these differences manifest themselves in distinctly different quantifiable ways that can be illustrated using the models presented in this paper. In Afghanistan and Iraq, a foreign force sought to depose an organised group practising governance over a distinct geographical region. In Afghanistan, that group was able to maintain some coherence and maintain its existence and assert itself against the foreign force. In Iraq, the disbanding of the military and the ruling Bath party rendered the former government incoherent and led to factional violence between groups divided along religious-political lines, with one faction coalescing and ultimately asserting against the new government. In Israel, a voluminous history of conflict and struggle for existence and peace continues entwined and reflected in the story of the Palestinian people in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. In both cases, the violence ebbs and flows with political tides as an extension of the tools of negotiation. In both cases, multitudes of groups and individuals engage in terrorist activity despite efforts by the Palestinian Authority to overcome internal struggles, exert control over disparate groups, and join the legitimate political sphere. This is in contrast to Afghanistan and Iraq where the largely unified groups exercising terrorist acts stayed out of the legitimate political sphere. What can be discerned from the model results is how the overall intensities of activity vary over time and between context and how external and internal factors influence these intensities.

What these models provide is not a set of definitive answers for classifying or predicting terrorist activity, but rather a set of lenses through which to view data and interpret its meaning. It is the ultimate responsibility of the user to determine if these interpretations are useful and meaningful. In this sense, it is hoped that the results presented in this paper can make some contribution to understanding the factors that can affect the spread of terrorism and political violence.

References.

- BANDURA, A. (1990). Mechanisms of Moral Disengagement. In *Origins of Terrorism: Psychologies, ideologies, theologies, states of mind* (W. Reich, ed.) 161-191. Cambridge University Press, Cam-

bridge.

- BRAITHWAITE, A. (2010). Resiting Infection: How State Capacity Conditions Conflict Contagion. *Journal of Peace Research* **47** 311–319.
- BRAITHWAITE, A. and JOHNSON, S. (2012). Space-Time Modeling of Insurgency and Counterinsurgency in Iraq. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* **28** 31 – 48.
- BROSIUS, H.-B. and WEIMANN, G. (1991). The Contagiousness of Mass-Mediated Terrorism. *European Journal of Communication* **6** 63–75.
- BRYNJAR, L. and SKJØLBERG, K. (2000). Why Terrorism Occurs - A Survey of Theories and Hypotheses on the Causes of Terrorism Technical Report, Norwegian Defence Research Establishment. <http://www.ffi.no/no/rapporter/00-02769.pdf>.
- BUHAUG, H. and GLEDITSCH, K. S. (2008). Contagion or Confusion? Why Conflicts Cluster in Space. *International Studies Quarterly* **58** 215–233.
- CLIFF, C. and FIRST, A. (2013). Testing for Contagion/Diffusion of Terrorism in State Dyads. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* **36** 292–314.
- COLEMAN, J. S. (1964). *Introduction to Mathematical Sociology*. Free Press.
- CRENSHAW, M. (1981). The Causes of Terrorism. *Comparative Politics* **13** 379–399.
- CRENSHAW, M. (1986). *Political Psychology: Contemporary Problems and Issues* The Psychology of Political Terrorism 379–413. Jossey-Bass Reprinted in John T. Jost and Jim Sidanius, eds., *Political Psychology: Key Readings* (Taylor and Francis, 2004).
- DALEY, D. J. and VERE-JONES, D. (2003). *An Introduction to the Theory of Point Processes I*, 2nd ed. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.
- DIEKMANN, A. (1979). A Dynamic Stochastic Version of the Pitcher-Hamblin-Miller Model of “Collective Violence”. *Journal of Mathematical Sociology* **6** 277–282.
- DUGAN, L., LAFREE, G. and PIQUERO, A. (2005). Testing a rational choice model of airline hijackings. *Criminology* **43** 1031–1066.
- EINSTEIN, A. (1905). Über die von der molekularkinetischen Theorie der Wärme geforderte Bewegung von in ruhenden Flüssigkeiten suspendierten Teilchen. *Annalen der Physik* **17** 549–560.
- ENDERS, W. and SANDLER, T. (2005). Transnational Terrorism 1968–2000: Thresholds, Persistence and Forecasts. *Southern Economic Journal* **71** 467–482.
- FABER, J., HOUWELING, H. W. and SICCAMA, J. G. (1984). Diffusion of War: Some Theoretical Considerations and Empirical Evidence. *Journal of Peace Research* **21** 277–288.
- FELLER, W. (1943). On a General Class of “Contagious” Distributions. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **14** 389–400.
- FICK, A. (1855). Über Diffusion. *Poggendorff’s Annalen* **94** 59–86.
- FROBENIUS, L. (1897/98). Der westafrikanische Kulturkreis. *Petermanns Mitteilungen* **43/44**.
- GELMAN, A., HWANG, J. and VEHTARI, A. (2014). Understanding predictive information criteria for Bayesian models. *Statistics and Computing* **24** 997–1016.
- GREENWOOD, M. and YULE, G. U. (1920). An Inquiry into the Nature of Frequency Distributions Representative of Multiple Happenings with Particular Reference to the Occurrence of Multiple Attacks of Disease or of Repeated Accidents. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* **83** pp. 255–279.
- GURR, T. R. (1993). Why Minorities Rebel: A Global Analysis of Communal Mobilization and Conflict since 1945. *International Political Science Review* **14** 161–201.
- HACKER, F. J. (1981). *Behavioural and Quantitative Perspectives on Terrorism* Contagion and Attraction of Terror and Terrorism 73–85. Pergamon.
- HAMILTON, J. D. and HAMILTON, L. C. (1981). Models of social contagion. *The Journal of Mathematical Sociology* **8** 133–160.
- HAMILTON, L. C. and HAMILTON, J. D. (1983). Dynamics of Terrorism. *International Studies Quarterly* **27** 39–54.
- HASTIE, T., TIBSHIRANI, R. and FRIEDMAN, J. (2001). *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining,*

- Inference and Prediction*. Springer.
- HAWKES, A. G. (1971a). Point spectra of some mutually exciting point processes. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B* **33** 438–443.
- HAWKES, A. G. (1971b). Spectra of Some Self-Exciting and Mutually Exciting Point Processes. *Biometrika* **58** 83–90.
- HAWKES, A. G. and OAKES, D. (1974). A Cluster Process Representation of a Self-Exciting Process. *Journal of Applied Probability* **11** pp. 493–503.
- HEYMAN, E. and MICKOLUS, E. (1980). Observations on “Why Violence Spreads”. *International Studies Quarterly* **24** 299–305.
- HILL, S. and ROTHCHILD, D. (1986). The Contagion of Political Conflict in Africa and the World. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* **30** 23–35.
- HOFFMAN, B. (2006). *Inside Terrorism*. Columbia University Press.
- HOLDEN, R. T. (1986). The Contagiousness of Aircraft Hijacking. *American Journal of Sociology* **91** 874–904.
- HOLDEN, R. T. (1987). Time Series Analysis of a Contagious Process. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **82** 1019–1026.
- HOPPER, R. D. (1950). The Revolutionary Process: A Frame of Reference for the Study of Revolutionary Movements. *Social Forces* **28** pp. 270–279.
- HUTCHINSON, M. C. (1972). The concept of revolutionary terrorism. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* **16** 383–396.
- KROEBER, A. L. (1940). Stimulus diffusion. *American Anthropologist* **42** 1–20.
- LAFREE, G., DUGAN, L. and KORTE, R. (2009). The Impact of British Counter Terrorist Strategies on Political Violence in Northern Ireland: Comparing Deterrence and Backlash Models. *Criminology* **47** 17–45.
- LE BON, G. (1896). *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind*. Macmillan.
- LEWIS, E., MOHLER, G., BRANTINGHAM, P. J. and BERTOZZI, A. L. (2011). Self-exciting point process models of civilian deaths in Iraq. *Security Journal*. advance online publication 19 September.
- LI, R. P. and THOMPSON, W. R. (1975). The “Coups Contagion” Hypothesis. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* **19** 63–88.
- MIDLARSKY, M. I. (1978). Analyzing diffusion and contagion effects: The urban disorders of the 1960s. *The American Political Science Review* **72** 996–1008.
- MIDLARSKY, M. I., CRENSHAW, M. and YOSHIDA, F. (1980). Why Violence Spreads: The Contagion of International Terrorism. *International Studies Quarterly* **24** 341–365.
- MOHLER, G. O. (2013). Modeling and estimation of multi-source clustering in crime and security data. *Annals of Applied Statistics* **7** 1525–1539.
- MOHLER, G. O., SHORT, M. B., BRANTINGHAM, P. J., SCHOENBERG, F. P. and TITA, G. E. (2011). Self-exciting point process modeling of crime. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **106** 100–108.
- MOST, B. A. and STARR, H. (1980). Diffusion, Reinforcement, Geopolitics, and the Spread of War. *American Political Science Review* **74** 932–946.
- NATIONAL CONSORTIUM FOR THE STUDY OF TERRORISM AND RESPONSES TO TERRORISM (START), (2015). Global Terrorism Database [Data file]. Retrieved from <http://www.start.umd.edu/gtd>.
- NEYMAN, J. (1939). On a New Class of “Contagious” Distributions, Applicable in Entomology and Bacteriology. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **10** 35–57.
- OGUNLADE, J. O. (1979). Personality characteristics related to susceptibility to behavioral contagion. *Social Behavior and Personality: an International Journal* **7** 205–208.
- ONSAGER, L. (1931). Reciprocal Relations in Irreversible Processes. I. *Physical Review* **37** 405–426.
- PITCHER, B. L., HAMBLIN, R. L. and MILLER, J. L. L. (1978). The Diffusion of Collective Violence. *American Sociological Review* **43** 23–35.
- PORTER, M. D. and WHITE, G. (2012). Self-exciting Hurdle Models for Terrorist Activity. *Annals of*

- Applied Statistics* **6** 106-124.
- SCHMID, A. and JONGMAN, A. (2005). *Political Terrorism*. Transaction Publishers.
- SPIEGELHALTER, D. J., BEST, N. G., CARLIN, B. P. and VAN DER LINDE, A. (2002). Bayesian measures of model complexity and fit. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **64** 583–639.
- TELESCA, L. and LOVALLO, M. (2006). Are global terrorism attacks time-correlated? *Physica A* **362** 480-484.
- TEORELL, T. (1936). Studies on the “Diffusion Effect” Upon Iconic Distribution I. Some Theoretical Considerations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **21** 152–161.
- THORNTON, T. P. (1964). *Internal War Terror as a weapon of political agitation* 71-99. Free Press, New York.
- TOWNSLEY, M. (2008). Visualising Space Time Patterns in Crime: The Hotspot Plot. *Crime Patterns and Analysis* **1** 61-74.
- WATANABE, S. (2010). Asymptotic equivalence of Bayes cross validation and widely applicable information criterion in singular learning theory. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **11** 3571–3594.
- WEIMANN, G. and BROSIUS, H. (1988). The predictability of international terrorism: A timeseries analysis. *Terrorism* **11** 491-502.
- WHITE, G. and PORTER, M. D. (2013). GPU Accelerated MCMC for Modelling Terrorist Activity. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis* **71** 643–651.
- WHITE, G., PORTER, M. D. and MAZEROLLE, L. (2013). Terrorism Risk, Resilience and Volatility: A Comparison of Terrorism in Three Southeast Asian Countries. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* **29** 295–320. DOI 10.1007/s10940-012-9181-y.
- WINTHROP, R. H. (1991). *Dictionary of Concepts in Cultural Anthropology*. Greenwood, New York, NY.
-
- | | |
|--|---|
| SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING FACULTY | CONSIGLIO NAZIONALE DELLE RICERCHE ISTITUTO DI MATEMATICA APPLICATA E |
| MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES SCHOOL | TECNOLOGIE INFORMATICHE |
| QUEENSLAND UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY | MILANO, ITALY |
| BRISBANE, QUEENSLAND 4001 | AND |
| AUSTRALIA | INSTITUTE OF FUTURE ENVIRONMENTS, QUEENSLAND UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY |
| E-MAIL: gentry.white@qut.edu.au | BRISBANE, QUEENSLAND |
| | AUSTRALIA |
-
- DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS, STATISTICS, MANAGEMENT SCIENCE
 UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
 348 ALSTON HALL, Box 870226
 TUSCALOOSA, AL 35487